

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

As set forth in the preceding section, claims 1, 11, and 13 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled herein.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11 and 13 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 11, and 13 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the current amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102:

Claims 1, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takaoka et al. ("Takaoka") WO02/080155, U.S. Patent No. 7,293,203 used as a translation. Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takaoka. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites at least the following:

"generating a jump signal in response to a state of the land/groove signal varying;
moving the optical pickup back by ½ of a track in response to the jump signal;

The portions of Takaoka cited in the Office Action, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features.

The Office Action asserts at page 2 that Takaoka describes all of the above-recited features at col. 7, lines 20-50.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Takaoka is directed to a disc driving apparatus including a tracking error signal generator and a half track jump control circuit adapted to control a movement of an optical pickup (col. 11, lines 1-15). However, in performing a half-track jump, Takaoka describes "servo processor 5 generat[ing] track-driving signals TD for half-track jump, according to the signals JD, HLS, JS, L 1 and L 2, supplied from the system controller 13, to send the generated track-driving signals TD to the driving circuit 6" (col. 6, lines 30-33, emphasis added). Takaoka, therefore, does not

describe performing a half-track jump in response to signal SLG output by land/groove detector 17 (col. 4, lines 52-55), but rather in response to signals JD, HLS, JS, L 1 and L 2. Accordingly, Takaoka fails to disclose "generating a jump signal in response to a state of the land/groove signal varying," as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Independent claim 1 further recites at least the following:

"determining from which track the tracking error signal has been generated using the generated land/groove signal, in response to the determination that the tracking error signal has been generated;

The Office Action asserts at page 2 that Takaoka describes all of the above-recited features at col. 7, lines 20-50.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the portion of Takaoka cited in the Office Action, taken alone or in combination, fails to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features.

The portion of Takaoka cited in the Office Action describes a method for generating TCMPH and TMCPL signals by the TCMP signal-generating circuit 77 shown in FIG. 4, and a method for controlling the half-track jump (col. 7, lines 20-23 and line 38). However, the Office Action fails to establish how either of these methods describe "determining from which track the tracking error signal has been generated using the generated land/groove signal," as recited in claim 1. In fact, the cited portion of Takaoka fails to even mention signal SLG generated by land/groove detector 17.

Independent claim 1 further recites at least the following:

"wherein a microcomputer of the DVD-RAM disc drive receives the land/groove signal and determines from which track the tracking error signal has been generated"

Applicant respectfully asserts that the portions of Takaoka cited in the Office Action, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features.

Referring to FIG. 1 of Takaoka, servo processor 5 is illustrated as receiving an SLG signal from land/groove detector 17. However, Takaoka does not describe servo processor 5 as a micro-computer, as recited in claim 1 above. In contrast, other components of Takaoka such as system controller 13, are indicated as constituting a micro-computer (col. 4, lines 36-37). Accordingly, because Takaoka fails to illustrate or describe "a microcomputer of the DVD-RAM disc drive receives the land/groove signal," Takaoka fails to disclose all of the above-recited features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Takaoka, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 11 and 13, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not suggested or disclosed by Takaoka, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 11 and 13 also allowed.

Claims 6 and 7, which depend from and include all of the features of independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 19, 2009

By:


David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501